### PREHEARING CONFERENCE

### BEFORE THE

# CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Application for Certification	)	Docket No.
for the Palen Solar Power	)	09-AFC-7
Plant Project	)	
-	)	

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

HEARING ROOM B

1516 NINTH STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2010 2:02 p.m.

Reported by:

Peter Petty, CER

Contract No. 170-09-002

# COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert B. Weisenmiller, Commissioner and Presiding Member
Karen Douglas, Chairman and Associate Member
Galen Lemei, Advisor to Ms. Douglas

# HEARING OFFICER, ADVISORS

Raoul Renaud, Hearing Officer

Eileen Allen, Advisor to Commissioner Weisenmiller

Galen Lemei, Advisor to Commissioner Douglas

# STAFF, CONSULTANTS AND STAFF WITNESSES

Lisa DeCarlo, Staff Counsel

Alan Solomon, Project Manager

James Jewell (via telephone)

Michael Donovan (via telephone)

Susan Sanders (via telephone)

## APPLICANT

Scott Galati, Attorney Robert Gladden, Attorney Galati and Blek for Solar Millennium

Alice Harron, Senior Director of Project Development Michael Cressner Solar Millennium, LLC

### INTERVENORS

Jason W. Holder, Attorney, (via telephone)
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
representing California Unions for Reliable Energy (CURE)

Laura Cunningham (via telephone)
Basin and Range Watch (B&RW)

Lisa T. Belenky, Attorney, (via telephone) Center for Biological Diversity (CBD)

### ALSO PRESENT

Dale Evenson (via telephone) Riverside County Fire Department INDEX

Page
Proceedings 1

Call to Order and Introductions 1

Discussion 3

Opportunity for Public Comment 35

Closing Remarks 35

Adjournment 35

36

Reporter's Certificate

# PROCEEDINGS

2:02 p.m.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good afternoon. This is the Prehearing Conference for the Palen Solar Power Project at the California Energy Commission.

My name is Raoul Renaud. I'm the Hearing Advisor assigned by the Committee to participate in these proceedings. To my right is the Presiding Member of the Committee, Commissioner Weisenmiller, and to his right is his advisor, Eileen Allen. To my left is Chairman Karen Douglas who is the Associate Member of this Committee, and her advisor to her left is Galen Lemei.

We are also -- we have our Web Ex system running this afternoon. I can see on the screen we have a number of callers in and we will get to you for introductions momentarily.

This proceeding is being recorded today and will be transcribed into a typed booklet that will be available for all the world to see on the Commission website.

Let's begin then with introductions of those here in the room starting with the Staff, please.

MS. DeCARLO: Good afternoon. Lisa DeCarlo, Energy Commission Staff Counsel. To my right is Energy Commission Project Manager Alan Solomon.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. And the

1	Applicant, please.
2	MR. GALATI: Scott Galati, representing Palen
3	Solar Power, a Solar Millennium company.
4	MS. HARRON: Alice Harron, Solar Millennium.
5	MR. CRESSNER: Michael Cressner, Solar Millennium.
6	MR. GLADDEN: Bob Gladden with Solar Millennium.
7	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.
8	And turning to the, to the phone we have a number of parties
9	who have intervened in this case. And let me ask first if
10	we have anyone on the phone representing CURE.
11	MR. HOLDER: Yes, and good afternoon. This is
12	Jason Holder on behalf of CURE.
13	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you and welcome.
14	Californians I'm sorry, the Center for Biological
15	Diversity, CBD.
16	MS. BELENKY: Yes, this is Lisa Belenky for Center
17	for Biological Diversity.
18	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Hi, Lisa, thank you for
19	calling in. Basin and Range Watch?
20	MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, Laura Cunningham, Basin
21	and Range Watch.
22	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Welcome, thank you. Is
23	there anyone from CARE, Californians for Renewable Energy?
24	(No response.)
25	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Are there any Intervenors

1 I've missed? I think I got everyone.

(No response.)

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Is there anyone else on the phone who would like to introduce themselves?

MR. EVENSON: Dale Evenson, Riverside County Fire.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Welcome, sir. Anyone

else?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JEWELL: This is James Jewell, the Commission's consultant on light and vision.

11 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. Anyone else?

MR. DONOVAN: Michael Donovan, Commission's Soil and Water expert.

14 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you.

MS. SANDERS: Susan Sanders, biologist, Energy Commission staff.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you.

Okay, well, then let's proceed. For those of you participating by phone, please bear in mind that we can hear everything that is going on at your end, so either keep the noise level low or mute your phone. But please don't put us on hold because you may very well start some music that we don't particularly want to hear. So we appreciate you keeping all that in mind.

Okay, let's get to the Prehearing Conference.

This is the Conference that the Committees for the Energy Commission Siting Proceedings typically hold in advance of the evidentiary hearings to analyze and assess the parties' readiness for evidentiary hearings. In this case we've scheduled the evidentiary hearings for October 13th and 14th and October 27th.

In the Notice of Prehearing Conference we asked that the parties file Prehearing Conference Statements and we did receive those from the Applicant, the Staff, Basin and Range Watch, CBD, and CURE, and we do thank you for those Prehearing Conference Statements.

Probably the most important question we ask you to address in your Prehearing Conference Statement is which topics are ready in each party's view to proceed to evidentiary hearings, and which party -- which topics are not. And by "topics" I'm referring to the environmental topics that are set forth in the decisions that we put out here.

And there is some divergence among you on which topics are ready and which are not. The Applicant provided a table to their statement marked Table One, and describes each topic as Category One, Two, or Three. And I'm thinking maybe just for purposes of organization here today, we might want to just use that to help keep us, keep us going down the road. It's not an endorsement of Mr. Galati's technique

but it's the one we've got and I think it might work.

Category One is where the Applicant agrees with the Staff's analysis and does not think that live testimony is warranted. And, in such a case, if no party has live testimony to put on we will typically accept the testimony in written form by declaration of the parties.

Category Two is where the Applicant and Staff are in disagreement about the conclusions reached by Staff or the conditions of certification and, therefore, direct, live testimony and cross-examination would be warranted. And that's the type of proceeding where the Committee would listen to the witnesses and then it would be the Committee's job to adjudicate the issues there.

And Category Three is topic areas where the Applicant disagrees with Intervenors and we would need live, direct testimony and cross-examination.

Now, the Applicant has placed just about everything in Category One except Biological Resources and Traffic and Transportation. Biological Resources is always a large issue in these desert solar power projects that cover so much land. Traffic and Transportation in this case is limited to the issue of the glint and glare possibilities from the mirrors of the solar project and the possible effect they might have on aircraft or motorists. I didn't see any Category Three items, but I think that's probably

because you don't have anything from the Intervenors yet.

Staff, I think you're pretty much in agreement with Applicant except for Air Quality, and you're not ready to proceed because you have no FDOC from the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

MS. DeCARLO: Correct. We hope to have something by the, right before the 27th and we'll then be able to update our testimony on that. But as it stands now we don't believe our testimony is complete to proceed.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay. And you have also indicated that you think Biological Resources may require adjudication and again I think that's not surprising to the Committee. That's very likely where we'll be spending quite a bit of time in the evidentiary hearings. That is one of the topics we will not hold until October 27th to accommodate CBD, which would not be available for the earlier sessions.

Staff has also indicated Alternatives as one of the possible stipulated or noncontent, nondisputed topics. However, CBD has indicated interest in pursuing Alternatives further and that also is one of the topics we'll do on October 27th; same for Soil and Water Resources. And it appears that CBD at least, perhaps others, will want to have testimony and evidence and have an opportunity to crossexamine on that topic.

Basin and Range Watch has also indicated some concerns. And I would like to actually ask CBD, was it Laura? Laura, are you there, Laura Cunningham?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: In Item Two of your

Prehearing Conference Statement you've indicated that the

following topics are not complete and not ready to proceed,

and there's quite a few of them here: Biological Resources,

Soil and Water, Visual, Alternatives, Air Quality, Hazardous

Materials, Worker Safety, and Cultural Resources. On what

basis does, do you contend those are not complete? What

more do you need?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: On Visual Resources we had questions on the nearness of wilderness areas and how that would be mitigated, and it probably can't be. On Hazardous Material we had a few questions involving therminol and leaks and safety on that. And that might be able to be just be resolved with more questions, more - like a cross-examination. And Cultural, apparently there is still quite a lot of issue with some of the tribes, but since they're not participating we probably couldn't speak for them. But we feel Cultural is definitely not settled, not resolved.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, we have some questions on Air Quality, too.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: What about Air Quality?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: When you say they're not complete, what we interpret that to mean is that more evidence needs to be gathered. Are you planning to gather more evidence on those topics?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: We're actually trying to get some information, even maybe an expert witness on Cultural, but we probably -- I don't know if we can in time for the hearing. So yes, the answer's yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay. And why weren't you able to do that earlier, get that witness, because the other parties have lined up witnesses by now?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: These are tribal members and they need -- actually just let us know about a week ago of their concerns concerning Palen.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Are there any other witnesses you're trying to line up besides the Cultural?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: No.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Pardon my ignorance, but probably everyone else here knows this but I don't. In number three you've indicated impacts to tortoises, DWMA. What does that mean, DWMA?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Desert Wildlife Management Area.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I see, all right, all right, okay. Thank you for that explanation.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Sorry about that.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: No, that's all right.

All right, and then CBD, your statement is similar to that of Basin and Range Watch, indicates some topics you view as not complete. You indicate you're preparing to proceed on October 27th on Air Quality, Alternatives, Biological, and Soil and Water, and that was the understanding that we would do those topics on the October 27th date.

And you indicate you don't think they're complete because of lack of adequate information and analysis of the impacts. So basically you're saying you don't think the analysis to date is sufficient. Does CBD intend to produce additional information or gather additional facts to be able to present that in an affirmative manner?

MS. BELENKY: Well, on Alternatives and Biological Resources we will submit testimony -- I guess it's due now tomorrow, specific testimony. Given the very short time since we've had the RSA, we haven't yet been able to determine whether we need to have affirmative testimony on Air Quality and Soil and Water. But I suppose that we will have to waive that because of the very short timeline. But we do not believe that those are complete and we would like the opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses from the Staff and the Applicant on those issues.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, the RSA Part Two came out September 16th and the hearing on those topics is October 27th. Do you think between now and then you'd be able to get ready?

MS. BELENKY: Yes, but not get the testimony by what was actually supposed to be today.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I understand, okay. That makes sense.

MS. BELENKY: I think we feel that we can get ready for these topics by the 27th but, you know, it's a very short date to try and get experts and line them up for testimony by tomorrow.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. And the Committee did set forth a schedule which gives you until -- I'm going to get the date here -- oh, I see, yeah. We did ask for all the testimony to be filed starting tomorrow and then the rebuttal on the 11th. And are you indicating you would need more time than that to be ready for the 27th?

MS. BELENKY: Well --

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's something we could talk about here. I mean, we --

MS. BELENKY: Oh, okay. I mean, it would definitely help us if we could submit opening testimony on some of these issues. I mean, the Alternatives and Biology we're prepared to submit tomorrow.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good.

MS. BELENKY: And if we would have at least the option of submitting additional testimony. And I would say at least until the October 12th because the 11th is technically a holiday for most people. So that would -- or even a few days more than that would really help as far as us being able to have an affirmative case. And we may determine we don't need it but I think at this time we would like to at least have a chance to make that determination.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Let me just throw this out for discussion here. What would the Applicant think of CBD's proposal to allow additional time for their filing on Alternatives -- no, Air Quality and Soil and Water Resources?

MR. GALATI: First of all I think that we don't have a problem with extending some of it, but I'd like to talk to you about rebuttal as well. Like for example, I'm not planning to bring any witnesses or file any testimony in Soil and Water other than I agree with Staff. That's what my opening testimony is going to be, so I have to wait until somebody files testimony that I disagree with to file a rebuttal. I can't anticipate what the issues are and file affirmative testimony about what they might be. So we do need at least a week for rebuttal testimony for anything that does come in. So I don't have any problem going to the

12th, but then we need probably to the 19th or 20th to be able to file rebuttal testimony. So if I could get a better understanding of which areas would be filed on the 12th and which areas would be filed tomorrow, that might be helpful.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: The two that would be later would be Soil and Water and Alternatives, I believe you said, right?

MS. BELENKY: No, no. Alternatives and Biological Resources are going to be filed tomorrow.

10 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's right. Then it's 11 Air Quality, right?

MS. BELENKY: Air Quality and Soil and Water, yeah.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Air Quality and Soil and Water Resources.

MR. GALATI: What would be helpful -- that would be fine. Can we move all rebuttal testimony to the 19th? It's kind of hard to, you know, have two rounds of rebuttal testimony. Ms. Belenky, would you mind if we moved all rebuttal testimony to the 19th?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: On the four topics for the 27th.

MR. GALATI: I was thinking I don't have any idea on all the rebuttals. For example, Basin and Range Watch has questions on or disputed the topic area of the safety of

HTF, so --

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, but that's an October 13-14 topic.

MR. GALATI: Yeah, okay, I see what you're saying.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: So --

MR. GALATI: Rebuttal testimony for everything that is after the 13th-14th on those four topics, we could have those to the 19th.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay, anybody else wish to -- Staff, do you want to weigh in on that?

MS. DeCARLO: I don't see a problem with that. We have varying staff schedules, they wanted to take some vacation before the 27th hearing but I think we can accommodate that.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Any of the other parties want to respond to CBD's proposal to extend the time for filing testimony on Air Quality and Soil and Water Resources until several days past. We're thinking -- you mentioned the 12th. I was thinking maybe the 15th.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Laura Cunningham here. We are accepting of that.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Anyone else?

MR. GALATI: If you moved it to the 15th, could we have a week to file rebuttal testimony? So we would move that to the 22nd.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: The Committee can live with that. I mean --

MR. GALATI: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: -- we'll be able to be ready. I know CBD has their retreat that week. So I'm just thinking toward the end of that week might be, might help you. Would it, would it Ms. Belenky?

MS. BELENKY: Yeah, that's fine. I'm sure I'm going to be working during the retreat, but at least I'll be in a beautiful, remote location while I do it.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Undisclosed, I take it?

MS. BELENKY: Well, you know, somewhere in

Arizona.

MR. GALATI: Okay. Do the parties agree that if we move, if we move rebuttal testimony to the 22nd we could use -- it's rebuttal testimony for all four of those topic areas. For example, if they file Biology on the 6th, can I have until the 22nd to file Biology rebuttals to the 22nd?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: On the theory that we're doing all four of those on the 27th?

MR. GALATI: Correct. I also had an issue with my particular biologist who is in the field doing preconstruction surveys on some of the projects you just approved, and so I could use some time. I was going to ask for the 20th, but if we do it all on the 22nd, if the

1 | Committee's okay with that, that would help us.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think from the Committee's perspective this sounds reasonable. Go ahead, Staff.

MS. DeCARLO: Well, that does crunch Staff's ability to prepare for hearings; it only gives us two days.

And depending upon the extensiveness of the rebuttal --

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Two topics would be better than four, in other words.

MS. DeCARLO: It would, but, you know, Staff will do what we can.

MR. GALATI: I would point out, though, that everybody's testimony, opening testimony is rebuttal to Staff. So rebuttal is due on the 6th and rebuttal to each other is due on the 22nd.

MS. DeCARLO: I guess I would just be concerned if rebuttal went extensively beyond the opening testimony, if it was used to expand upon that.

MR. GALATI: From the Applicant's perspective our rebuttal to Staff will be filed on the 6th and that, on the 22nd, we'll be rebutting things we've seen for the first time on the 6th from the parties. That's all we'll be addressing.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think that sounds reasonable and doable. Rebuttal typically isn't as

extensive as opening testimony and parties should be able to absorb that and be prepared to address it over the course of five days after that, so I think that's how, that's how we'll proceed.

Getting back to Basin and Range Watch,

Ms. Cunningham, I wanted to ask you about another statement
in your, in your Prehearing Conference Statement, number
five. You indicated you needed to see the other parties'
Prehearing Conference Statements, witness lists, and exhibit
lists. You couldn't be certain about the nature or extent
of cross-examination. Do you have anything further for us
on that since you now have the Prehearing Conference
Statements from the parties?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, I can just say we would want ten minutes cross-examination time for the listed issues.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay, we'll make note of that.

MR. GALATI: Okay, just to clarify. For example on the list, which we'll be hearing on the 13th and the 14th, is Hazardous Materials and Worker Safety and Cultural Resources.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Right.

MR. GALATI: All of those areas I was not intending to bring a witness. Is Ms. Cunningham asking for

an Applicant witness or is she asking for Staff witness to cross-examine? I don't know what the issues are.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I guess it would be Staff if we had any questions. I'm actually still reading through the Staff Assessment so I'll be prepared next week.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I'm not sure what that means, be prepared next week. Oh, you'll be prepared next week.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, I'm still reading through the Revised Staff Assessment and I'll know more what I would like to ask Staff.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Does Basin and Range Watch anticipate addressing the issue of Cultural Resources to any great extent?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Maybe just ten minutes or less worth of questions.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay, okay, good. CURE, we haven't heard from you. Anything you wish to tell us about?

MR. HOLDER: Thank you very much, Hearing Officer Renaud. We did come to an agreement with the Applicant and I have a - I can describe that for you if you'd like or we can talk about that later.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, usually we -- well, there isn't any usually. I've seen this done at the, at the

first session of the evidentiary hearings, CURE would come in and put the agreement on the record. You might want to plan on doing that anyway. I'm not sure we need to know much more about it than that. If it's something you'd like to file in advance, you'd be welcome to do that as well.

MR. HOLDER: I'd like to describe it just briefly, and we do intend to docket it either today or tomorrow.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, go ahead.

MR. HOLDER: Well, first of all I want just to express our appreciation for both the Staff and the Applicant's diligence in analyzing the impacts of the project. And I want to express my appreciation for the Commission's transparent process for conducting environmental review and for allowing us the opportunity to intervene in this proceeding as Intervenors.

Our agreement, the Applicant has committed to implementing measures to avoid and minimize significant impacts to desert washes, special status plants, and wildlife during construction and operation of the project. The Applicant also committed to minimizing the impacts to desert tortoise by preparing a desert tortoise translocation and relocation plan that complies with the latest Fish and Wildlife Service guidelines. And the Applicant has also agreed to implement measures to respond to the potential presence of unexploded ordinance and munitions that are

potentially present on the project site, as appropriate.

So we're happy to announce this agreement and we don't anticipate presenting evidence or witnesses at the evidentiary hearings.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Well, thank you for that and we're pleased to hear that your client's concerns have been resolved.

MR. HOLDER: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Parties, let's talk a little bit about the order of presentation. Sometimes there is a witness who is only available for a certain time window and so we try and work around that. Is anybody aware of anyone they wish to call as a witness who can only appear at a certain time on the 13th and 14th?

MR. GALATI: I guess I -- On the 13th and 14th -first of all, I believe, based on what I'm seeing in the
other parties Prehearing Conferences and our own is I don't
believe we'll need the 14th. From the Applicant's
perspective, I was only going to put affirmative testimony
on the 13th and 14th related to one condition of
certification and one tiny piece of it on Trans-6. I
estimated 30 minutes just so I wouldn't underestimate, and
30 minutes of possible cross-examination of staff on that
point alone. I believe that is for the 13th and 14th the
only live testimony that I'd be presenting. I would ask the

Committee to budget maybe about 45 minutes to an hour to accept all the rest of the documents in as evidence with the exhibits marked and get those into the record.

And so the only other thing that -- from the Applicant's perspective that I needed to understand was who needs me to bring a live witness in an area that I don't have a dispute with Staff. So I need someone to say -- does my Hazardous Materials person need to be present or whatever. But I actually think that we have been extremely productive.

So switch to the 27th for just a minute so the Committee appreciates the hard work that Staff and Applicant have done. We are down to three conditions that we are having any further discussion about. We had a framework that I thought that might actually work for two of those conditions, it's Biology 23 and Biology 24. The only reason I placed it as disputed, the Staff hasn't yet seen our proposed language since we worked on it yesterday, and so we haven't yet filed it. But it is entirely likely that at least some of what we put in 23 and 24 will be accepted by Staff because we had great conversations. So, again, I don't think that would take very long.

And then lastly is a very narrow issue of how indirect impacts or calculated on Bio-20 for the Mojave fringe-toed lizard, associated with sand transport. Again,

a very narrow issue.

So I think that Staff has been very good in working with us, working on alternative language, and I -- we're down to probably an hour and a half of dispute with Staff on a very large project. So from our perspective I think that we're being very efficient and we don't see a lot of Committee time. Of course, I reserve the right to see what the Intervenors file because I probably will be bringing rebuttal witnesses. But that will be the large amount of time, it seems to me, is responding to the Intervenors' testimony.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you for that. Staff, do you wish to weigh in there?

MS. DeCARLO: The only potential time constraint we have is for our Hazmat and Worker Safety expert whom, I guess, Basin and Range Watch wanted to cross-examine. He is not available on the 13th from 11 to one. But if we could tackle that first, first thing that morning when we start at ten, and Basin and Range Watch indicated they only needed about ten minutes for cross-examination. We might need about 15 minutes of direct.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good, thank you.

All right.

MR. GALATI: And I did forget that one of our witnesses is specifically associated with the desert

tortoise. She will be in the field so she can call in if the Committee is okay with her actually calling in and being sworn over the phone.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: So this would be the 27th.

MR. GALATI: That would be for the 27th and that's based -- Right now we don't plan on using her, but I'm assuming if we get some sort of rebuttal testimony that we need to respond to.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, great.

MR. GALATI: We'll have a panel available. She'll be one of them but she'll have to call in.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Basin and Range Watch, the Committee asked each party to list the topics that you would wish to cross-examine witnesses, the summary of the scope of such cross-examination, and the time. You've indicated ten minutes on one topic. Are there other topics or other specific witnesses you want to be able to cross-examine in person on October 13th?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Not at this time.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: And now is the time, so we need to make plans.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: The answer is no.

24 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

25 And CBD, we know your time will be on the 27th and I think

by then we'll have a pretty good idea of --

MS. BELENKY: Yeah. I just wanted to say, because I think there's some confusion here. The Center did participate in the workshops, the last two workshops on Biological Resources. The fact that the Applicant and the Staff have been able to reach agreement does not mean that other parties have not attempted to reach agreement or have not been part of bringing issues forward. I think that -- I just don't want to leave any misunderstanding on that point.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes. No, I don't think we assumed, made that assumption at all, we understand. And all we're trying to do at this point is get an idea of which parties need to have available which witnesses, and I think we've pretty much got that sorted out for October 13th. And as to October 27th, I think we might as well table that question for a little while until we see some testimony filed and then you'll be able to give us a better idea about that. Would I be correct in saying that?

MS. BELENKY: Yes. We may have a revised amount of time we might want to cross-examine different people once we see the testimony.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. That sounds reasonable.

MS. DeCARLO: I have a quick question for the Committee.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: 1 Yes. 2 MS. DeCARLO: Basin and Range Watch's request 3 cross-examination on Visual Resources. Our expert is in 4 Would the Committee like him to appear in person or 5 is telephonically acceptable? HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Basin and Range Watch, do 6 7 you still want to cross-examine the Visual Resources 8 witness, excuse me, on October 13th? 9 MS. CUNNINGHAM: No, we don't need to. 10 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Then that 11 settles that. All right. 12 MR. GALATI: And just to clarify for the record, 13 the Applicant is not required to bring anybody to the 13th 14 or the 14th hearings for cross-examination? 15 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: No. 16 MR. GALATI: Basin and Range Watch nor -- and the 17 issues that were raised by CBD will be handled on the 27th. 18 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Right, I think so. Did 19 you all hear that? Just if anybody disagrees with that, let 20 me know. 21 MS. CUNNINGHAM: We agree with that. 22 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you. 23 MS. DeCARLO: And one additional question. On the 24 27th we'll be prepared to bring our Soil and Water experts.

We do have one expert who is focused solely on drainage

25

1	issues, and I'm just wondering if the parties have an idea
2	whether or not they want to cross-examine Staff at this
3	point on drainage or if that's something they need more time
4	to determine.
5	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, that's a good
6	question. Let's start with Applicant.
7	MR. GALATI: No, Applicant and Staff are in
8	complete agreement on all areas of Soil and Water.
9	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: CBD? This would be
10	drainage.
11	MS. BELENKY: If by drainage you mean surface
12	water, then yes we may, and I would know more a little bit
13	later.
14	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Issues about washes is
15	what I assume you're talking, yes.
16	MS. DeCARLO: That's correct.
17	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay. So we'll take that
18	as a tentative yes.
19	MS. BELENKY: Yes.
20	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Any other party on
21	washes, drainage across washes?
22	MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, Basin and Range Watch might
23	want to cross-examine on that.
24	HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, very good.
25	MS. DeCARLO: Okay, we'll make sure

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: We're pretty sure we'll need people then. All right.

Now, tomorrow is the big day then. You'll be filing your testimony -

MR. GALATI: That's correct.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: -- your exhibits and so on in written form so that we can all see them.

MR. GALATI: That's correct and that brings up -one of the things we did in the Genesis Project that I'm
specifically asking Basin and Range Watch and CBD, you know,
I have large boxes as the Applicant has the burden of proof,
I have several tens of exhibits. And what we would like to
be able to do is make a CD with those all on PDF and serve
you with those rather than try to serve a large box.
Everything's been docketed previously. Were you okay
receiving this on a CD?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Basin and Range Watch, is a CD okay?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, Laura Cunningham here.

That is completely acceptable to us. Can I give you the correct mailing address for that so we can get it in time, Scott?

MR. GALATI: Yes, please. Is this, is this a place I can pop in the mail or FedEx to you?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Could it be Priority Mail, U.S.

1 | Post Office?

2 MR. GALATI: Sure.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: P.O. Box 70, Beatty, B-E-A-T-T-Y, Nevada 89003. I really appreciate it. Thanks.

MR. GALATI: Okay, and I would also extend the courtesy for any exhibits that any of the other parties are filing. Staff already have theirs through the Staff Assessment. I would accept those as a CD as well. You don't have to make hard copies and send them to me. If you don't have very many and you want to serve me by e-mail; that would be fine as well.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is everyone else okay with receiving a CD of the Applicant's exhibits as opposed to paper, a big box of paper?

MS. BELENKY: This is the Center for Biological Diversity. Yes, I think we're fine with receiving the CD and we would be happy to serve everything by e-mail, our exhibits.

I just want to clarify that we still need to serve a printed copy for the docket. Is that correct?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes, I'm afraid you do.

MS. BELENKY: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yeah, someday we have to change our regulations about that to bring us into the 21st century, but for now we still need some paper, I'm sorry to

say that.

MR. GALATI: It wasn't long ago when it was one and twelve copies to Docket.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yeah, twelve, right. A truckload, it's true.

MS. BELENKY: Well, and I just wanted to clarify. I mean, this is something I had written down to bring up today. In one of the other matters we'd actually went to all e-mail at one point and in this matter, you know, the Center, both Ms. Anderson and I had asked to be e-mail preferred and it was never put on the Proof of Service. But I really feel like when we're especially dealing with such short deadlines it kind of doesn't make sense to be doing all this mailing and it's a waste of paper and resources. So if there's any way that we could limit not just the use of -- if we could go not just for the exhibits to the use of e-mail or CDs, but also for all of the documents, I think that that would be a big positive step.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think we have been using electronic for copies of documents extensively and I would encourage everybody to do that. If anybody needs paper copies, of course you're entitled to them, but so far I haven't really seen people ask for that.

I do have a request, however, for those using electronic formats, particularly CDs, and that is to somehow

make it so that you can look at the -- open the CD and it says Exhibit One, Exhibit Two, Exhibit Three and you can click on it and it takes you to that exhibit. I don't like having to scroll through trying to find, you know, the next exhibit. So if there's some way to click to it that would be great. I would really appreciate that.

MR. GALATI: We certainly can. And Hearing Officer Renaud, we prepare two boxes. And while I wasn't planning on giving you a CD as well, did you want a CD of the exhibits?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes, both please.

MR. GALATI: Then we will do that.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Does anybody wish to add anything further? I think we're pretty much done here.

(Long pause.)

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay, thank you for holding on there for a moment. I'm going to take this opportunity to remind the parties of the schedule issued by the Committee dated September 28th, which sets forth filing deadlines for the exhibits and testimony and so on. And we consider those firm. It's only fair to the other parties that each party abide by those dates. We have discussed some changes to those dates today and we will issue an order reflecting those changes.

But as far as the filing of your opening and

rebuttal testimony, the dates established by the Committee are firm and we expect all parties, and that means including Intervenors, to abide by those dates. Okay? Mr. Galati?

MR. GALATI: Okay. Just to make it easy for the record. So opening testimony which has been modified by stipulation of the party and granted by the Committee is tomorrow, the 6th --

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Right.

MR. GALATI: -- for all topics except for Air Quality and Soil and Water Resources, which has been moved to the 12th, I believe.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: The 15th.

MR. GALATI: The 15th. Rebuttal testimony is still due on the 11th for all topics except for those going on October 27th, those four topics, which is now extended to the 22nd. I think that's what we discussed.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes, that's my understanding, too. So except for those four, rebuttal is October 11th, and as to those four it's going to be the 22nd.

MR. GALATI: I have one --

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: let me just --

MR. GALATI: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: -- make sure everybody's

25 | in agreement with that. Staff?

MS. DeCARLO: Yes, that was my understanding.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay. CBD?

MS. BELENKY: Yes, that's my understanding.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Basin and Range Watch?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: We agree.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good, thank you.

Mr. Galati?

MR. GALATI: I have one other thing to help the Committee because we appreciate very much the Committee's still working towards getting a decision by the end of the year, and the more times things get moved and the later in October that things come and it really squeezes the presiding members' proposed decision.

I will try the following proposal again. If the parties would agree, I believe that we can dispense with written briefs, unless the Committee directs a particular legal brief. And I wanted to make a distinction between arguing the facts versus arguing the law, and that I would like written briefs to be about an area of law or policy that the Committee needs more legal research on.

But in order to give the parties an opportunity to argue the facts, I would ask for the Committee to consider, at the disputed topic areas, a brief closing statement which is both parties' lawyers describing what they think the facts say and what they think the Committee should do.

Sometimes we do those in briefs and I think that it has, there's two benefits to that. One, it puts it in the record so the Committee can understand, and two -- they can see it all in one place -- and then two, it keeps the parties on focus. If you write a closing argument before you come to a hearing, you know where you're going to end up so you don't stray. So I would recommend both of those to help with the PMPD writing.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: The Committee likes that proposal and thinks it would be a very good way of summarizing each party's position and highlighting the points you've been trying to make. Does anybody else wish to say anything about that proposal? Obviously you wouldn't have to make these closing arguments, but you'd have the opportunity to. I think we would limit the time to, I'm not sure exactly how many minutes, but I'm thinking five to ten minutes on each topic.

MS. DeCARLO: And would that occur at the end of the day or at the end of each topic area?

MR. GALATI: End of each topic.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay. That sounds fine with Staff.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Any of the other parties oppose that idea?

(No response.)

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. That will be

the order then, we'll allow closing arguments on each topic, but they are optional.

MS. BELENKY: I'm sorry. I just want to understand. I understand they're optional. I'm not really sure I understood Mr. Galati's statements about the briefing.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MS. BELENKY: I don't know that closing statements are -- our issue -- let me just put this, make this very clear. For the Center, one of the problems would be, at least the other projects that we've been involved in, is things change even during the hearing, the day before the hearing, the day after the hearing. So being sort of pushed to make a clear statement on one day and then have all the other parties go out and make different decisions the next day, doesn't really help anybody.

I understand that's the process. I understand that's what apparently the Commission prefers, but it is very hard to have a specific position that is stable when the facts and the position of the other parties keep changing. So I don't know that we would participate in a closing statement, but I think that has been the confusion all along.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, one thing I might suggest to you is that if you find, by the time we get to

the end of a topic, that you feel changes have taken place of which you didn't have notice or don't understand or something, the closing argument might be a time to highlight that. It would be something the Committee could take into consideration hearing from, hearing from you about that.

And I agree also about the written briefs. We don't know if we're going to need those, but if we do written briefs should focus on law, legal arguments not factual ones.

All right. Basin and Range Watch, are you -- how do you feel about this idea of the closing arguments? Does that sound okay or you would object?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, that sounds okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good. Anyone

16 (No response.)

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Does anyone
-- any of the parties wish to say anything further before we
move to public comment?

MR. GALATI: Nothing from the Applicant.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: None. Staff?

MS. DeCARLO: Nothing from Staff.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay. Intervenors,

24 anything?

else?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. CUNNINGHAM: No

MR. HOLDER: No, thank you. 1 2 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good. there anyone on the phone who would like to comment to the 3 4 Committee about the proceedings today? If you do, just 5 speak up, state your name, and then proceed. 6 (No response.) 7 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, I don't hear 8 anyone. Either member of the Committee wish to say anything 9 to close out? Commissioner Weisenmiller? 10 COMMISSIONER WEISENMILLER: Yeah. We'd like to 11 thank the parties for their participation today and to 12 encourage people to work hard on trying to settle the issues 13 you can, and where you can't settle those, to be prepared to 14 go to hearings. Thanks again. 15 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you, and we're 16 adjourned. 17 (Whereupon, the Status 18 Conference was adjourned.) 19 --000--20 21 22 23 24 25

#### CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Status Conference; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said conference, nor in any way interested in outcome of said conference.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of October, 2010.

PETER PETTY, CER\*\*D-493

#### CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

\_\_\_October 8, 2010

CAROL EDWARDS